

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**Planning Board**

**August 28, 2021**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Karla Conway, Butch Duffney, Charlie Dake, Robert Roeckle, Joe Sabanos, Nick Querques, and Tonya Yasenchak are present. Mike Gyarmathy is absent. Charlie Baker Town Engineer is present. M. Waldron, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present.

---

**Minutes**

To be reviewed at the next meeting.

T. Yasenchak states that the Board has to approve May 11, 2021 Minutes. She has not had an opportunity review them and feels that they are long at 31 pages and need to be modified. She knows that the secretary does not have the time to do that. R. Roeckle states that if they can be sent to him in a Word document he can do that. T. Yasenchak states that she can do that.

---

Grassi, J. Case #647  
TM# 151.-2-57

369 Grange Road  
Major Subdivision

Justin Grassi is present. J. Grassi states that they received updated plans on July, 15. They also had a letter from our Town Engineer, it is dated today so he understands that there will be probably some discussion going on about that. T. Yasenchak states that the Board did open a public hearing on this, and adjourned it because additional information was requested. The Board may or may not open the public hearing again tonight. J. Grassi states that the Board indicated that they do not like to approve shared driveways we have modified the layout to have traditional driveways. In addition, there were some Board comments, 1 of the lots there was the owner of the green space. There will be 3 acres of green space. What they did was they opened it up to take ownership of the land and the layout itself is a little more traditional a little more clear as to what the intent there will be. The remainder of the subdivision is still a 14 lot subdivision on Grange Road. The comments in relation, some of which we responded to and he thinks the first nine they have responded to. Back in May, we have confirmed with DEC and ACOE as far as far as the wetlands. They are heard back from New York SHPO yesterday. They have some other comments that they have sent down to the Town Engineer to respond formally to. At this time, what they will be asking from the Board is to refer the application to the Saratoga County Planning Board for their recommendation. C. Baker states that his questions are related to detailed design. All that stuff is just the general engineering that will be worked out. T.

Yasenchak asks C. Baker if he has any comments or concerns with the test pits. C. Baker states the smaller lots should show the preliminary lay out for the house, septic system and the well. R. Roeckle ask if C. Baker has any comments on lots, 3 and 4 because of the wetlands. It appears that it would be less than an acre of land for the well the septic and the house. Do you have any comments or concerns about those lots. J. Grassi states based on the soil that they get there and try for conventional systems. J. Grassi states the wetlands on the on the western portion of the property are ACOE wetlands, and that requires 100' buffer. He just wanted to clarify that. N. Querques asks if there is still some sort of easement still the case. J. Grassi states yes, that hasn't changed. B. Duffney states if C. Baker doesn't have any major issues with it then he is good with it. C. Baker states everything can be worked out. J. Sabanos asks if when he do the drive thru for clearing limits in there as well and asks if he will have those on there because he doesn't think it is. J. Grassi states at this point the most extreme clearing that would be necessary, hopeful they can limit the amount of clearing they would like to keep the trees that's part of what they love the look of a forest and as he mentioned before as for how they remember, they still intend, at least part of the family to take for at least for the trees. They are looking to keep the rural feel. T. Yasenchak states this is very helpful having this overall removal plan, but if there was an overlay of this and she believes that was one of C. Baker actually asked for that. She thinks for new owners who may be buying a lot to know specifically where that is in relation to their lot. They probably won't be able to just by looking at the rest of the map. C. Baker states that would be very helpful. C. Dake states that all of his concerns have been addressed. She states that because of the proximity to the Grange Road is within 500' of a County road she requests the Secretary to please send a referral to the County Planning Board for their review and referral and believes the Board can ask for lead agency status. She believes what letter needs to be sent to DEC, DOT, and ACOE requesting lead agencies. C. Baker states one of the comments was that a landscape plan be submitted and he thinks that's very important. If the Applicant is clearing a significant area of tree removal and degrading, and depth, and, the Board will need to see the specific request of the deed language dedication of the roadway. J. Grassi states just to clarify, at this point there's nothing that's needed from them as far as sending anything to the County Planning Board or any aspect of it. T. Yasenchak states she does not believe so, no.

---

Pileckas, P. Case #660  
TM# 164.-1-32.14

32 Mill Road  
Minor Subdivision

Paul Pileckas is present. P. Pilekas states this is a 4 lot minor subdivision on Mill Road. There will be 1 keyhole lot that is further to the north. In this Zoning District it is 1.5 acre minimum. T. Yasenchak states that she has questions about site distance. C. Baker confirms that the site distance is AASHTO, however he has not been out there yet. R. Roeckle asks if lot 3, is that P. Pileckas is considering a keyhole he is assuming because of the frontage. These are unique lots. He is not sure how it meets site distance. T. Yasenchak states it was unclear, the way that survey looks like. It looks like the property line is in the middle of the road so it doesn't make sense. P. Pileckas states that this property is in both the Town of Greenfield and in Saratoga Springs and it is confusing. The property line is the middle of the road. R. Roeckle asks how the right of way is. That needs to be clarified. This is a unique parcel. B. Duffney ask how long is lot 4 driveway. P. Pileckas states it is 265'. D. Duffney states if a driveway is 500' or longer it will need emergency vehicle turnarounds. How big is are the

houses going to be. P. Pileckas states the normal 4 bedrooms homes. T. Yasenchak states that the Board has been asking for this for some time. J. Sabanos states that he would like to see a clearing and grading plan. Lot 4 wraps around the south of the property can the applicant incorporate it into lot 1 to make it as clean as possible. P. Pileckas states that there is a nice big rock on the lot that hee would like to use in the landscaping. C. Dake asks if the applicant will be looking to subdivide the big lot in the future. P. Pilckas states that he usually keeps one lot bigger whenever he does subdivisions. T. Yasenchak asks if the wetlands have been classified by DEC or ACOE. She is concerned about lot 1. Maybe the applicant could combined lots 1 and 2. The Board can't approve anything moving forward if it would require a shared driveway. The Board does not approve them. She would also like to see a grading and clearing plan. She does not feel that the Board has enough information for preliminary approval. R. Roeckle states this should go to the County. T. Yasenchak states that she does not feel that the Board has enough information to send it to the County yet. R. Roeckle asks what is the frontage at the Town's right of way. B. Duffney asks if the City of Saratoga will be notified of a public hearing. K. McMahon states yes.

---

Picarello, L. Case #661  
TM# 98.-1-2

261 Miner Road  
Major Subdivision

Dan Wheeler is present as the Authorization of Agent for this project. D. Wheeler states that this is a 6 lot major subdivision. He did have the site distance done. They are planning an easement or a shared driveway for 2 lots. T. Yasenchak which lots would have an easement or shared driveway. D. Wheeler states lot 4, he couldn't get site distance. Possibly they could create a keyhole lot where hopefully the site distance would be better. T. Yasenchak asks 2 keyhole lots instead of 1. K. Conway states that she does not like keyhole lots or or shared driveways it invites litigation at some point. C. Dake states the neither are acceptable to him. J. Sabanos states that he appreciates the 2 options, but agrees with J. K. Conway and C. Dake. R. Roeckle states he is less concerned with the keyhole lots. What is the topography there and how will it affect the driveway. D. Wheeler states that it is not very steep there. R. Roeckle states that lots 4 and 6 would be long driveways. N. Querques states that this is too aggressive for te LDR District. B. Duffney states that the property is not steep grades, but either way he is stuck. He states that he does not like to restrict people. The Town has had problems in the past with shared driveways. How wide are the keyhole lot driveways. N. Queques states 60'. T. Yasenchak states she is not concerned about keyhole lots it puts the house away from the road. She reads the Code for keyhole lots. The Board does not typically approve keyhole lots. C. Dake states lot 6 is the most acceptable. J. Sabanos states lot 6 is not the worst scenario without topography it is hard to tell. C. Baker states that he is looking for topography, a report on the site distance, and where it meets the ASSTHO requirements.

---

## **DISCUSSION**

T. Yasenchak states she is concerned about the one lot in the front of P. Pileckas's property. R. Roeckle asks the lot near the road. T. Yasenchak states not the one with the strip of land. M. Waldron states that he will have to make a determination and write a letter for the Board.

\_\_\_\_\_  
T. Yasenchak asks where is Gerry McKenna's case. She asks K. McMahon to compose a letter for this case. The Board needs to finish SEQRA. The time line has started and it needs be completed. K. McMahon states that he called the office today and is withdrawing his application and submitting a new application for something different. R. Roeckle states that it will have to go to DOH, DEC, the County, and ACOE. Once that is received the Board needs to make sure it is a Negative Declaration. The ZBA needs it for their general review. B. Duffney state that if the ZBA took care of it the Planning Board wouldn't have to worry about this. This property is too dense for this project. T. Yasenchak states we will need to have withdrawal in writing. M. Waldron states that if he is adding supplemental plans then he will need a new application. R. Roeckle states that if he is proposing something new or changing anything he will have to re-submit a new application. T. Yasenchak states the Planning Board took lead agency for the SEQRA review at the last meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m. All members in favor.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

DRAFT